

**NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN THE OFFICIAL REPORTS**

California Rules of Court, rule 977(a), prohibits courts and parties from citing or relying on opinions not certified for publication or ordered published, except as specified by rule 977(b). This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 977.

IN THE COURT OF APPEAL OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

SECOND APPELLATE DISTRICT

DIVISION SEVEN

In re L.M., a Person Coming Under the  
Juvenile Court Law.

B217261

(Los Angeles County  
Super. Ct. No. TJ18038)

THE PEOPLE,

Plaintiff and Respondent,

v.

L.M.,

Defendant and Appellant.

APPEAL from an order of the Superior Court of Los Angeles County,  
Charles Scarlett, Judge. Affirmed.

Bruce G. Finebaum, under appointment by the Court of Appeal, for  
Defendant and Appellant.

No appearance for Plaintiff and Respondent.

---

On February 11, 2009, the minor L.M.'s legal guardian came home to discover the minor had broken into a locked home office and had taken \$20. The minor later admitted breaking into her guardian's home office. On April 9, 2009, a Welfare and Institutions Code section 602 petition was filed against the minor, then 17 years old, alleging she had committed residential burglary (Pen. Code, § 459). The minor denied the allegation.

Following a jurisdiction hearing, the juvenile court sustained the petition, found the offense to be a felony, declared the minor a ward of the court and ordered her into suitable placement. The court calculated a maximum term of confinement of six years.

The minor filed a timely notice of appeal challenging the jurisdiction order. We appointed counsel to represent the minor on appeal.

After examination of the record, counsel filed an opening brief in which no issues were raised. On October 19, 2009, we advised the minor she had 30 days within which to personally submit any contentions or issues she wished us to consider. No response has been received to date. We have examined the entire record and are satisfied the minor's attorney has fully complied with the responsibilities of counsel and no arguable issues exist. (*Smith v. Robbins* (2000) 528 U.S. 259, 277-284 [120 S.Ct. 746, 145 L.Ed.2d 756]; *People v. Wende* (1979) 25 Cal.3d 436, 441.)

The order under review is affirmed.

**WOODS, Acting P. J.**

**We concur:**

**ZELON, J.**

**JACKSON, J.**